

REMARKS

Claims 1-78 remain in the application for consideration. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the application be forwarded on to issuance.

§ 103 Rejections

Claims 1-78 stand rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,038,378 to Kita et al. (hereinafter "Kita").

Before undertaking a discussion regarding the substance of the Office's rejections, the following discussion of the § 103 Standard is provided.

The § 103 Standard

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, *three basic criteria must be met*. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. *In re Merck & Co., Inc.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). *The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure.* *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1439 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

1 Hence, when patentability turns on the question of obviousness, the search
2 for and analysis of the prior art includes evidence relevant to the finding of
3 whether there is a teaching, motivation, or suggestion to select and combine the
4 references relied on as evidence of obviousness. See, e.g., *McGinley v. Franklin*
5 *Sports, Inc.*, 262 F.3d 1339, 1351-52, 60 USPQ2d 1001, 1008 (Fed. Cir. 2001)
6 ("the central question is whether there is reason to combine [the] references," a
7 question of fact drawing on the Graham factors). The mere fact that references *can*
8 be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless
9 the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d
10 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990). "To support the conclusion that the
11 claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must
12 expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or *the examiner must*
13 *present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found*
14 *the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the*
15 *references.*" *Ex parte Clapp*, 227 USPQ 972, 973 (Bd.Pat. App. & Inter.
16 1985)(emphasis added).

17 "The factual inquiry whether to combine references must be thorough and
18 searching." *Id.* It must be based on objective evidence of record. This precedent
19 has been reinforced in myriad decisions, and cannot be dispensed with. See, e.g.,
20 *Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. v. Philip Morris Inc.*, 229 F.3d 1120, 1124-
21 25, 56 USPQ2d 1456, 1459 (Fed. Cir. 2000) ("a showing of a suggestion,
22 teaching, or motivation to combine the prior art references is an 'essential
23 component of an obviousness holding'" (quoting *C.R. Bard, Inc., v. M3 Systems,*
24 *Inc.*, 157 F.3d 1340, 1352, 48 USPQ2d 1225, 1232 (Fed. Cir. 1998)); *In re*
25 *Dembiczak*, 175 F.3d 994, 999, 50 USPQ2d 1614, 1617 (Fed. Cir. 1999) ("Our

1 case law makes clear that the best defense against the subtle but powerful
2 attraction of a hindsight-based obviousness analysis is rigorous application of the
3 requirement for a showing of the teaching or motivation to combine prior art
4 references."); *In re Dance*, 160 F.3d 1339, 1343, 48 USPQ2d 1635, 1637 (Fed.
5 Cir. 1998) (there must be some motivation, suggestion, or teaching of the
6 desirability of making the specific combination that was made by the applicant); *In*
7 *re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1075, 5 USPQ2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988) ("teachings
8 of references can be combined only if there is some suggestion or incentive to do
9 so.") (emphasis in original) (quoting *ACS Hosp. Sys., Inc. v. Montefiore Hosp.*,
10 732 F.2d 1572, 1577, 221 USPQ 929, 933 (Fed. Cir. 1984)); *In re Fritch*, 23
11 USPQ2d 1780, 1784 (Fed. Cir. 1992) ("***It is impermissible to use the claimed***
12 ***invention as an instruction manual or 'template' to piece together the teachings***
13 ***of the prior art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious.*** [O]ne cannot
14 use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the
15 prior art to deprecate the claimed invention.") (quoting *In Re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071,
16 1075, 5 USPQ2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988)).

17 ***The need for specificity pervades this authority.*** See, e.g., *In re Kotzab*,
18 217 F.3d 1365, 1371, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000) ("***particular***
19 ***findings must be made as to the reason the skilled artisan, with no knowledge of***
20 ***the claimed invention, would have selected these components for combination in***
21 ***the manner claimed***").

22 In view of the guidance provided above, Applicant disagrees with the
23 Office's obviousness rejections and respectfully submits that the Office has not
24 made out a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully
25 requests withdrawal of these rejections.

1 **Claims Rejected over Kita under § 103**

2 **Claim 1** recites a method for testing software comprising:

- 3
- 4 • modeling software using a software model that describes behavior
5 associated with the software; and
 - 6 • ***operating on the software model using a random destination
7 algorithm and at least one other different algorithm*** to produce a
8 sequence of test actions, the random destination algorithm being
9 configured to ***randomly select a destination*** in the model and move
10 to that destination to produce the sequence of test actions.

11 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that “operating
12 on the software model using a random destination algorithm and at least one other
13 different algorithm to produce a sequence of test actions” is disclosed in Kita (Col
14 3, lines 25-35). The Office then admits that Kita does not disclose the algorithm
15 to be a random destination algorithm. However, the Office argues that the
16 Applicant has admitted that a random destination algorithm was well known in
17 that art at the time of the invention. The Office then concludes that it would have
18 been obvious to incorporate this knowledge into the teaching of Kita “because
19 doing so provides an efficient method to test the software with various methods
20 according to various requirement to evaluate the performance of the software
21 thoroughly.”

22 Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that the Office has not
23 established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

24 Applicant agrees that Kita does not disclose the algorithm to be a random
25 destination algorithm. Applicant disagrees with the Office’s obviousness rejection
 and reminds the Office that the prior art reference must teach or suggest ***all the***

1 **claim limitations.** Kita does not discuss operating on a software model using a
2 **random destination algorithm and at least one other different algorithm**, nor is
3 there a **suggestion or motivation** or reasonable **expectation of success** for doing
4 so. Instead, the cited portions of Kita describe automatically converting a program
5 specification into an EFSM or a multiple-EFSM architecture, and automatically
6 generating validation tests for implementations of that program specification. The
7 validation tests are generated by traversing valid paths through the EFSM (or
8 multiple-EFSM architecture) and coupling each of the paths with the source code
9 of the implementation in a program shell.

10 The Office has not addressed the claim feature “**and at least one other**
11 **different algorithm**”. Applicant has reviewed Kita and submits that it neither
12 discloses nor suggests any such feature.

13 Further, pages 5-10 of Applicant’s application do not admit that a **random**
14 **destination algorithm** was well known in the art, nor does the cited portion even
15 mention **random destination algorithm**. Applicant respectfully suggests that the
16 Office is mistaken and perhaps has confused “random walk” or “anti-random
17 walk” algorithms with “**random destination**” algorithm in regards to this portion.
18 Hence, for at least this reason, the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case
19 of obviousness.

20 Further, the Office has failed to present a **convincing line of reasoning** (as
21 required by 35 U.S.C. § 132 (see also MPEP 706.02(j)), explaining why it would
22 have been obvious to incorporate a random destination algorithm into the
23 teachings of Kita. To support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed
24 to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly
25 suggest the claimed invention or the examiner must present a convincing line of

1 reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have
2 been obvious in light of the teachings of the references. See, e.g. *Ex parte Clapp*,
3 227 USPQ 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

4 In the present case, the Office's attempt at a "convincing line of reasoning"
5 is to state simply that "*because doing so provides an efficient method to test the*
6 *software with various methods according to various requirement to evaluate the*
7 *performance of the software thoroughly.*" As noted above, particular findings
8 must be made as to the *reason* the skilled artisan, *with no knowledge of the*
9 *claimed invention*, would have selected these components for combination in the
10 manner claimed. *In re Kotzab*, 217 F.3d 1365, 1371, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317
11 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

12 Applicant respectfully submits that the Office has not made particular
13 findings as to the reason the claimed subject matter would be obvious in view of
14 the cited reference.

15 Additionally, and as an aside, the Office has provided a paper, available at
16 the following link:

17 <http://www.uspto.gov/web/menu/busmethp/busmeth103rej.htm>
18

19 that describes proper and improper rejections made under §103(a).
20 Particularly instructive is an example that appears in Section V of the paper
21 illustrating an improper §103(a) rejection which is based upon hindsight in view of
22 a general motivation statement. This example is reproduced below in its entirety
23 for the Office's convenience:

24 **V. Examples of Improper Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103**
25

Example 17: Improper rejection based upon hindsight - general motivation statement.

a. The claimed invention

The invention is drawn to a smart card containing a tracking mechanism, which tracks shopping preferences of consumers by recording the type, quantity, and dates of purchase for a pre-selected group of products. The smart card is useful in a system and method for introducing new and alternative products that are of the same type as products normally purchased by the shopper. The smart card records the shopper's purchases and submits an automatic notification to the shopper when a quantity threshold is achieved for the pre-selected products. This notification will encourage the consumer to consider alternative products by providing the consumer incentives, such as a pricing discount, to purchase an alternative product.

Claim 1:

A method for using a smart card in a marketing analysis program designed to introduce new products, the method comprising the steps of:

storing product information on the smart card when said products are purchased by a consumer wherein said information including type, quantity and dates of the product purchased;

identifying for each product a threshold for each of said type, quantity and dates of products purchased;

determining an incentive for an alternative product based on said threshold; and

automatically notifying said consumer when said threshold is reached for a given product identified on the smart card and providing the consumer with said incentive, whereby the incentive encourages the consumer to consider alternative products.

b. Evidence

Reference A discloses smart card that tracks consumer preferences by recording the type, quantity, and dates of purchase of pre-selected products to determine trends in consumer purchases. The smart card is periodically read by a scanner to determine its contents for market analysis. In return for using the smart card and participating in the marketing program, the user is provided with free product coupons for products that are normally purchased by the shopper.

1 Reference B discloses a traditional consumer incentive program that
2 provides coupons for the purchase of named products based upon the consumer's
3 purchase of those same products to promote customer loyalty.

4 **c. Poor statement of the rejection**

5 Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over
6 Reference A in view of Reference B. Reference A discloses the conventional use
7 of a smart card to track consumer preferences and provide incentives. However,
8 Reference A does not disclose the automatic notification to consumer providing
9 incentives. Reference B discloses providing incentives to consumers to purchase
10 the desired products. *It would have been obvious to combine Reference A's
11 smart card with Reference B's incentive to consumers because the combination
12 would allow Reference A's smart card to be more efficient.*

13 **d. Analysis**

14 The motivation, improve efficiency, is too general because it could cover
15 almost any alteration contemplated of Reference A and *does not address why* this
16 specific proposed modification would have been obvious. Additionally, there is
17 *nothing in either of references that would suggest* automatically notifying the
18 consumer when reaching a threshold nor is there anything in either reference that
19 would suggest the notifying step. Finally, although Reference B teaches a
20 traditional coupon scheme to promote customer loyalty, *there is no suggestion,
21 other than applicant's disclosure,* to employ this scheme to promote the
22 introduction of new and alternative products. *The rejection is improper.*

23 In the present rejection, the Office's statement "because doing so provides
24 an *efficient method*" is similar to the Office's example of an improper rejection
25 and does not address *why* this specific proposed modification would have been
obvious. In the Office's own words: "[t]he motivation, improve efficiency, is too
general because it could cover almost any alteration contemplated ... and *does not
address why* this specific proposed modification would have been obvious."
Therefore, the Office's rejection here is improper.

1 In view of the above discussion, the Office has not established a *prima*
2 *facie* case of obviousness and has made an improper rejection. Hence, for at least
3 these reasons, this claim is allowable.

4 **Claims 2-7** depend from claim 1 and are allowable as depending from an
5 allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
6 features, which, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are neither disclosed
7 nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one
8 another.

9 **Claim 8** recites one or more computer-readable media having computer-
10 readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the
11 computer to:

- 12 • model software using a software model that describes behavior
13 associated with the software, the software model comprising a state
14 graph having multiple nodes individual ones of which represent a
15 state, and links between the nodes that represent actions; and
- 16 • operate on the software model using a ***random destination***
17 ***algorithm and at least one other different algorithm*** to produce a
18 sequence of test actions, the random destination algorithm being
19 configured to randomly select a destination node in the model and
20 move to that destination node to produce the sequence of test
21 actions, the selection of the destination node being performed
22 independent of any previously-traversed nodes, and independent of
23 any nearest neighbor nodes.

24 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office relies on its reasoning
25 regarding claims 1-5. Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that the Office
has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

As discussed above, Kita does not discuss operating on the software model
using a ***random destination algorithm and at least one other different algorithm***,

1 as claimed. In addition, Applicant points out that there is no *suggestion or*
2 *motivation* or reasonable *expectation of success* for doing so. Further, pages 5-10
3 of Applicant's application do not admit that a *random destination algorithm* was
4 well known in the art, nor does the cited portion even mention *random destination*
5 *algorithm*. Finally, the Office has failed to present a *convincing line of reasoning*
6 as to why it would have been obvious to incorporate a random destination
7 algorithm into the teachings of Kita.

8 In view of the above discussion, the Office has not established a *prima*
9 *facie* case of obviousness and has made an improper rejection. Hence, for at least
10 these reasons, this claim is allowable.

11 **Claim 9** recites a method of testing software comprising:

- 12 • modeling software using a software model that describes behavior
- 13 associated with the software;
- 14 • operating on the software model using a *random destination*
- 15 *algorithm* to produce a sequence of test actions, the random
- 16 destination algorithm being configured to randomly select a
- 17 destination in the model and move to that destination to produce the
- 18 sequence of test actions; and
- 19 • operating on the software model using *multiple other algorithms*
- 20 *that are different from the random destination algorithm* to
- 21 produce a further sequence of test actions.
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

20 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office relies on its reasoning
21 regarding claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that the Office
22 has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

23 In view of the above discussion, the Office has not established a *prima*
24 *facie* case of obviousness and has made an improper rejection. Hence, for at least
25 these reasons, this claim is allowable.

1 **Claims 10-15** depend from claim 9 and are allowable as depending from an
2 allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
3 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 9, are neither disclosed
4 nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one
5 another.

6 **Claim 16** recites one or more computer-readable media having computer-
7 readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the
8 computer to:

- 9
10 • operate on a software model using a ***random destination algorithm***
11 to produce a sequence of test actions, the software model comprising
12 a state graph having multiple nodes individual ones of which
13 represent a state, and links between the nodes that represent actions,
the random destination algorithm being configured to randomly
select a destination node in the state graph and move to that
destination node to produce the sequence of test actions; and
- 14 • ***operate on the software model using multiple other algorithms that***
15 ***are different from the random destination algorithm*** to produce a
16 further sequence of test actions, the multiple other algorithms being
selected from a group comprising: a random walk algorithm, a
Chinese postman algorithm, a Markov chain algorithm, and a anti-
17 random walk algorithm.

18
19 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office relies on its reasoning
20 regarding claims 9-15. Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that the
21 Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

22 The Office's reasoning in regards to claims 9-15 ultimately represent the
23 reasoning of claims 1 and 2 combined with a single Office argument regarding
24 claims 11-15. In its reasoning regarding claims 11-15, the Office acknowledges
25 that Kita does not explicitly disclose a random walk algorithm, Chinese postman

1 algorithm, Markov chain algorithm, or anti-random walk algorithm. However, it
2 asserts that the applicant, on pages 5-10, admits that they were well known in the
3 art at the time the invention was made. The Office then reasons:

4 Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill
5 in the art to incorporate the well known knowledge into the teaching
6 of Kita et al to have the algorithm to be one of the well known
7 ***algorithm because doing so provides an efficient method*** to test the
8 software with various methods according to various requirement to
9 evaluate the performance of the software thoroughly.

10 This argument is essentially the same argument the Office makes in claim
11 1, except it refers to specific algorithms. Neither argument is valid because Kita
12 does not disclose or suggest operating on the software model using a ***random***
13 ***destination algorithm***, as claimed. Additionally, the cited portions of Kita do not
14 teach or suggest operating on the software model using ***multiple other algorithms***
15 ***that are different from the random destination algorithm***, as claimed. Therefore,
16 it is irrelevant whether or not the Applicant admits in pages 5-10 of the application
17 that a random walk algorithm, Chinese postman algorithm, Markov chain
18 algorithm, or anti-random walk algorithm was well known in the art. Regardless
19 of the types of algorithms available, there is no teaching or suggestion to operate
20 on the software model using a ***random destination algorithm***, as claimed; or to
21 ***operate on the software model using multiple other algorithms***, as claimed.

22 Further, for the same reasons as discussed above, the Office has failed to
23 present a ***convincing line of reasoning*** as to why it would have been obvious to
24 incorporate a random destination algorithm or multiple other algorithms into the
25 teachings of Kita.

1 In view of the above discussion, the Office has not established a *prima*
2 *facie* case of obviousness and has made an improper rejection. Hence, for at least
3 these reasons, this claim is allowable.

4 **Claim 17** recites a method of testing software comprising:

- 5
- 6 • traversing a state graph that models software, the state graph having
7 multiple nodes individual ones of which represent a state, and links
8 between the nodes that represent actions, said traversing ***using an***
9 ***algorithm having a first graph traversal characteristic*** to produce a
10 sequence of test actions; and
- 11 • traversing the state graph ***using an algorithm having a second***
12 ***graph traversal characteristic that is different from the first graph***
13 ***traversal characteristic*** to produce a further sequence of test actions.

14 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office relies on its reasoning
15 regarding claims 1 and 2. Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that the
16 Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness..

17 Applicant is confused in regards to the applicability of the Office's
18 reasoning in claims 1 and 2 to this claim. Claims 1 and 2 recite modeling software
19 and operating on the software model using a random destination algorithm and at
20 least one other different algorithm. This claim recites traversing a state graph. In
21 fact, this claim does not even expressly recite a "***random destination algorithm***".
22 Applicant respectfully submits that the Office has improperly expressed this
23 rejection, as described by MPEP 707.07(d). MPEP 707.07(d) states, in pertinent
24 part, that:

25 **IMPROPERLY EXPRESSED REJECTIONS**

An omnibus rejection of the claim "on the references and for the
reasons of record" is stereotyped and usually not informative and should

1 therefore be avoided. This is especially true where certain claims have
2 been rejected on one ground and other claims on another ground. A
3 plurality of claims *should never be grouped together in a common
4 rejection, unless that rejection is equally applicable to all claims in the
5 group.*

6 Nevertheless, the cited portions of Kita do not disclose or suggest the
7 features in this claim. Specifically, these portions do not disclose or suggest
8 traversing a state graph, as claimed, or *using an algorithm having a first graph
9 traversal characteristic and using an algorithm having a second graph traversal
10 characteristic that is different from the first graph traversal characteristic*, as
11 claimed.

12 Without a properly expressed rejection that is applicable to this claim
13 which explains the Office's reasoning, proper notice of the rejection, as required
14 (see 35 U.S.C. §132), has not been provided to the Applicant. Applicant submits
15 that the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness and has made
16 an improper rejection. Hence, for at least these reasons, this claim is allowable. If
17 the Office disagrees, Applicant requests that the Office properly apply the
18 reference and explain its reasoning for its rejection of this claim.

19 **Claims 18-21** depend from claim 17 and are allowable as depending from
20 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
21 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 17, are neither disclosed
22 nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one
23 another.

24 **Claim 22** recites a method of testing software comprising:

- 25 • traversing a state graph *using a deterministic first algorithm* to
produce a sequence of test actions, the state graph having multiple

nodes individual ones of which represent a state, and links between the nodes that represent actions; and

- traversing the state graph *using a second algorithm that is less deterministic than the first algorithm* to produce a further sequence of test actions.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office first argues that in Figure 2, Kita discloses “traversing a state graph using an algorithm to produce a sequence of test actions, the state graph having multiple nodes individual ones of which represent a state, and links between the nodes that represent actions.” It then argues that “traversing the state graph using a second algorithm that is less deterministic than the first algorithm to produce a further sequence of test actions” is disclosed by Kita (column 3 lines 25-34 and column 19 line 25 to column 20 line 21). The Office acknowledges that Kita “does not explicitly disclose the algorithm is a deterministic first algorithm”, but asserts that applicant admits (in pages 5-10 of the Application) that “*various types of were well known in the art at the time the invention was made*”. The Office then reasons:

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the well known knowledge into the teaching of Kita et al to have the algorithm to be a *deterministic first algorithm because doing so provides an efficient method to test the software* with various methods according to various requirement to evaluate the performance of the software thoroughly.

Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Applicant agrees that Kita does not disclose a “deterministic first algorithm, and further asserts that the cited portions of Kita do not disclose deterministic

1 algorithms at all. Specifically, figure 2 is described in Kita at column 5 Lines 61-
2 62 as “a state diagram of a simple example of an extended finite state machine
3 (EFSM).” Applicant fails to see how this figure discloses “traversing a state graph
4 using an algorithm to produce a sequence of test actions”. Further, “traversing the
5 state graph using a second algorithm that is less deterministic than the first
6 algorithm to produce a further sequence of test actions” is not disclosed in the
7 portions of Kita cited by the Office. The cited portions of column 3 describe
8 automatically converting a program specification into an EFSM or a multiple-
9 EFSM architecture, and automatically generating validation tests for
10 implementations of that program specification. The validation tests are generated
11 by *traversing valid paths* through the EFSM (or multiple-EFSM architecture) and
12 coupling each such path with the source code of the implementation in a program
13 shell. The cited portions of columns 19 to 20 describe traversing paths through the
14 EFSM. This indicates that this traversal “may be accomplished by a conventional
15 path generation method.” Further, a reference is made to an exhaustive path
16 generation method (all paths through the EFSM are traversed) or a constrained
17 method (limited paths traversed). Applicant notes that there is no disclosure or
18 suggestion in these cited portions concerning the use of a *first deterministic*
19 *algorithm and a second algorithm that is less deterministic than the first*
20 *algorithm*, as claimed.

21 Following its questionable and seemingly erroneous determination that a
22 second algorithm that is less deterministic than the first algorithm is disclosed, the
23 Office addresses the admitted absence of any disclosure in Kita to a first
24 deterministic algorithm. The Office reasons that “*various types of were well*
25 *known* in the art at the time the invention was made”. This statement is

1 nonsensical because *it does not indicate what the Office alleges was well known*
2 in the art. Therefore, the Office's subsequent reasoning that it would have been
3 obvious "to incorporate the well known knowledge into the teaching of Kita" is
4 indefinite because the "well known" knowledge alleged by the Office is never
5 disclosed. Perhaps more importantly, even if the "well known" knowledge had
6 been disclosed, the Office still would have failed to present a *convincing line of*
7 *reasoning* by relying solely on the notion that incorporating knowledge would
8 have been obvious *because doing so provides an efficient method to test the*
9 *software*. As discussed above, this argument does not address *why* a specific
10 proposed incorporation would have been obvious.

11 In view of the above discussion, the Office has not established a *prima*
12 *facie* case of obviousness and has made an improper rejection. Hence, for at least
13 these reasons, this claim is allowable.

14 **Claim 23** recites a method of testing software comprising:

- 15 • traversing a state graph using a random walk first algorithm to
16 produce a sequence of test actions, the state graph having multiple
17 nodes individual ones of which represent a state, and links between
the nodes that represent actions; and
- 18 • traversing the state graph *using a second algorithm that is less*
19 *random than the first algorithm* to produce a further sequence of
test actions.

20
21 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office reiterates the exact
22 language that is used for claim 22.

23 Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that the Office has not
24 established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. As discussed above, there is no
25 disclosure or suggestion in these cited portions concerning the use of *a second*

1 *algorithm that is less random than the first algorithm*, as claimed. In addition,
2 for the same reasons as discussed above, the Office's argument does not address
3 *why* a specific proposed incorporation would have been obvious.

4 In view of the above discussion, the Office has not established a *prima*
5 *facie* case of obviousness and has made an improper rejection. Hence, for at least
6 these reasons, this claim is allowable.

7 **Claim 24** recites a method of testing software comprising:

- 8
- 9 • providing *one or more algorithms* for operating on a software model
that describes behavior associated with software that is to be tested;
- 10 • selecting *one or more algorithms*;
- 11 • operating on the software model *using the selected one or more*
algorithms to produce a sequence of test actions;
- 12 • changing the selected *one or more algorithms*; and
- 13 • operating on the software model using *one or more changed*
algorithms.
- 14

15 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office relies on its reasoning
16 regarding claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that the Office
17 has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

18 Applicant is confused in regards to the applicability of the Office's
19 reasoning in claim 1 to this claim. Claim 1 recites a method for testing software
20 comprising modeling software and operating on the software model using a
21 random destination algorithm and at least one other different algorithm. This
22 claim does not expressly mention a *random destination algorithm*. Nevertheless,
23 Applicant submits that the cited portions of Kita, in regards to claim 1, do not
24 disclose or suggest the subject matter of this claim.
25

1 Without a properly expressed rejection that is applicable to this claim
2 which explains the Office's reasoning, proper notice of rejection has not been
3 provided to the Applicant. Nonetheless, Applicant has studied the reference and
4 submits that the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.
5 Hence, for at least these reasons, this claim is allowable. If the Office disagrees,
6 then Applicant respectfully requests that the Office properly explain its reasoning
7 for its rejection of this claim.

8 **Claims 25-27** depend from claim 24 and are allowable as depending from
9 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
10 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 24, are neither disclosed
11 nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one
12 another.

13 **Claim 28** recites one or more computer-readable media having computer-
14 readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the
15 computer to:

- 16 • provide *one or more algorithms* for operating on a software model
17 that describes behavior associated with software that is to be tested;
- 18 • select *multiple algorithms* to define a *first collection of algorithms*;
- 19 • operate on the software model using *the first collection of*
20 *algorithms* to produce a sequence of test actions;
- 21 • *change at least one of the selected algorithms to define a second*
22 *collection of algorithms*; and
- 23 • operate on the software model using the *second collection of*
24 *algorithms* to produce an additional sequence of test actions.

25 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office relies on its reasoning
regarding claim 24, which in turn relies on the reasoning in claim 1. Applicant

1 respectfully disagrees and submits that the Office has not established a *prima facie*
2 case of obviousness.

3 Applicant is confused in regards to the applicability of the Office's
4 reasoning in claim 1 to this claim. As discussed above, claim 1 recites a method
5 for testing software comprising modeling software and operating on the software
6 model using *a random destination algorithm* and at least one other different
7 algorithm, as claimed. This claim does not expressly mention a *random*
8 *destination algorithm*. Nevertheless, Applicant submits that the cited portions of
9 Kita, in regards to claim 1, do not disclose or suggest the subject matter of this
10 claim.

11 Without a properly expressed rejection that is applicable to this claim
12 which explains the Office's reasoning, proper notice of rejection has not been
13 provided to the Applicant. Nonetheless, Applicant has studied the reference and
14 submits that the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.
15 Hence, for at least these reasons, this claim is allowable. If the Office disagrees,
16 then Applicant respectfully requests that the Office properly explain its reasoning
17 for its rejection of this claim.

18 **Claim 29** recites a method of testing software comprising:

- 19
- 20 • traversing a state graph using a *random destination algorithm*, the
21 state graph having multiple nodes individual ones of which
22 representing a state, and links between the nodes that represent
23 actions, said traversing producing a sequence of test actions; and
 - 24 • traversing the state graph using *multiple steps from a random walk*
25 *algorithm* to produce an additional sequence of test actions.

1 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office relies on its reasoning
2 regarding claims 9-11, which in turn relies on the reasoning in claims 1-2 and 11.
3 Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that the Office has not established a
4 *prima facie* case of obviousness.

5 Applicant is confused in regards to the applicability of the Office's
6 reasoning in claims 9-11 to this claim. Claims 9-11 recite modeling software, as
7 claimed and operating on the software model, as discussed above. This claim
8 recites *traversing a state graph*, as claimed. Without a properly expressed
9 rejection that is applicable to this claim and which explains the Office's reasoning,
10 proper notice of rejection has not been provided to the Applicant. Therefore,
11 Applicant requests that the Office properly explain its reasoning for its rejection of
12 this claim.

13 Nevertheless, the cited portions of Kita do not disclose or suggest the
14 features in this claim. The argument the Office makes in claim 11 is essentially
15 the same argument it makes in claim 1, except it refers to specific algorithms.
16 Neither argument is valid because Kita does not discuss operating on the software
17 model using a *random destination algorithm*, as claimed. Additionally, the cited
18 portions of Kita do not teach or suggest operating on the software model using
19 *multiple steps from a random walk algorithm*, as claimed. Furthermore, pages 5-
20 10 of Applicant's application do not admit that a *random destination algorithm*
21 was well known in the art, nor does the cited portion even mention *random*
22 *destination algorithm*. As discussed above, it is irrelevant whether or not the
23 Applicant admits in pages 5-10 of the application that certain algorithms were well
24 known in the art. Regardless of the types of algorithms available, there is no
25

1 teaching or suggestion to traverse a state graph using a *random destination*
2 *algorithm* or *multiple steps from a random walk algorithm*, as claimed.

3 Further, for the same reasons as discussed above, the Office has failed to
4 present a *convincing line of reasoning* as to why it would have been obvious to
5 incorporate a random destination algorithm or multiple other algorithms into the
6 teachings of Kita.

7 Applicant asserts that, based upon the information provided, the Office has
8 not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness and has made an improper
9 rejection. Hence, for at least these reasons, this claim is allowable.

10 **Claims 30-36** depend from claim 29 and are allowable as depending from
11 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
12 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 29, are neither disclosed
13 nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one
14 another.

15 **Claim 37** recites a method of testing software comprising:

- 16
- 17 • selecting a *first algorithm from among a number of different*
algorithms;
- 18 • operating on a software model that describes behavior of software
19 that is to be tested, said operating taking N steps *using the first*
algorithm, where N is an integer and said steps produce a sequence
20 of test actions;
- 21 • selecting a *second algorithm from among the number of different*
algorithms, the *second algorithm being different from the first*
algorithm; and
- 22 • operating on the software model by taking N1 steps *using the*
second algorithm, where N1 is an integer, said N1 steps producing
23 an additional sequence of test actions.
- 24
- 25

1 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office relies on its reasoning
2 regarding claim 28, which in turn relies on the reasoning in claim 24, which in
3 turn relies on the reasoning in claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees and
4 submits that the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

5 Applicant is confused in regards to the applicability of the Office's
6 reasoning in claim 1 to this claim. As discussed above, claim 1 recites modeling
7 software and operating on the software model using a random destination
8 algorithm and at least one other different algorithm. This claim does not expressly
9 mention *a random destination algorithm*. Nevertheless, Applicant submits that
10 the cited portions of Kita, in regards to claim 1, do not disclose or suggest the
11 subject matter of this claim.

12 Without a properly expressed rejection that is applicable to this claim and
13 which explains the Office's reasoning, Applicant has not received proper notice of
14 rejection as required. Applicant requests that the Office properly explain its
15 reasoning for its rejection of this claim. In addition, Applicant asserts that, based
16 upon the information provided, the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of
17 obviousness. Hence, for at least these reasons, this claim is allowable.

18 **Claims 38-52** depend from claim 37 and are allowable as depending from
19 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
20 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 37, are neither disclosed
21 nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one
22 another.

23 **Claim 53** recites a method of testing software comprising:

- 24
- 25 • representing software using a model that describes the software's
behavior, the software having *an associated social context*; and

- selecting *one or more algorithms* to operate upon the model as a function of the software's *social context*; and
- operating upon the model using the *selected one or more algorithms* to produce a sequence of test actions.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office first argues that in Figure 2, Kita discloses “representing software using a model that describes the software’s behavior”. It then argues “operating upon the model using the selected one or more algorithms to produce a sequence of test actions” is disclosed by Kita (citing column 3 lines 25-34 and column 19 line 25 to column 20 line 21). The Office acknowledges that Kita “does not explicitly disclose the software having an associated social context; and selecting one or more algorithms to operate upon the model as a function of the software’s social context...” However, the Office takes **Official Notice** that “software having an associated social context; and selecting one or more algorithms to operate upon the model as a function of the software’s social context ...” were well known in the art at the time the invention was made. The Office then reasons:

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the well known knowledge to have the software having an associated social context; and selecting one or more algorithms to operate upon the model as a function of the software’s social context and the social context to be associated with the software developer *because doing so ensures the testing algorithm is selected appropriately for different software and provides an efficient method to test the software more accurately and more thoroughly.*

Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Applicant agrees that Kita does not explicitly disclose the software having an associated social context; and selecting

1 one or more algorithms to operate upon the model as a function of the software's
2 social context. Applicant disagrees with the Office's obviousness rejection and
3 reminds the Office that the prior art reference must teach or suggest *all the claim*
4 *limitations*. The cited portions of Kita do not disclose or suggest "representing
5 software using a model that describes the software's behavior, the software having
6 *an associated social context*"; "selecting *one or more algorithms* to operate upon
7 the model as a function of the software's *social context*"; or "operating upon the
8 model using the *selected one or more algorithms* to produce a sequence of test
9 actions." Instead, the cited portions of Kita describe automatically converting a
10 program specification into an EFSM or a multiple-EFSM architecture, and for
11 automatically generating validation tests for implementations of that program
12 specification. The validation tests are generated by traversing valid paths through
13 the EFSM (or multiple-EFSM architecture) and coupling each such path with the
14 source code of the implementation in a program shell.

15 In regards to "software having an associated social context" and "selecting
16 one or more algorithms to operate upon the model as a function of the software's
17 social context", the Office is taking Official Notice without the support of any
18 evidence in the record. Applicant traverses any such assertion by the Office and
19 requests that documentary evidence, pursuant to MPEP 2144.03(c) and 37 CFR
20 1.104(c)(2), be provided to support the Office's contention.

21 Further, the Office has failed to present a *convincing line of reasoning*
22 explaining why it would have been obvious to incorporate "the well known
23 knowledge to have the software having an associated social context" or "selecting
24 one or more algorithms to operate upon the model as a function of the software's
25 social context" into the teachings of Kita. As mentioned above, to support the

1 conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either
2 the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the
3 examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would
4 have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of
5 the references. In the present case, the Office's attempt at a *convincing line of*
6 *reasoning* is to state simply that "*because doing so ensures the testing algorithm*
7 *is selected appropriately for different software and provides an efficient method*
8 *to test the software more accurately and more thoroughly.*" As noted above,
9 particular findings must be made as to the *reason* the skilled artisan, *with no*
10 *knowledge of the claimed invention*, would have selected these components for
11 combination in the manner claimed. Here, the Office simply recites advantages
12 but *does not address why* this would have been obvious. Additionally, there is
13 nothing in Kita that would suggest using software having an associated social
14 context. The only teaching or suggestion to do this is found in Applicant's
15 disclosure. Applicant respectfully reminds the Office that the teaching or
16 suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of
17 success must both be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure.

18 In view of the above discussion, the Office has not established a *prima*
19 *facie* case of obviousness and has made an improper rejection. Hence, for at least
20 these reasons, this claim is allowable.

21 **Claims 54 and 55** depend from claim 53 and are allowable as depending
22 from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own
23 recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 53, are neither
24 disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination
25 with one another.

1 **Claim 56** recites a method of testing software comprising:

- 2
- 3 • developing a *profile associated with one or more software*
- 4 *developers*, the profile describing *one or more algorithms* that are
- 5 more likely to identify problems *associated with software developed*
- 6 *by the one or more software developers*;
- 7 • selecting, *from a developer's profile, one or more algorithms when*
- 8 *a software model associated with the developer's software* is to be
- 9 operated upon; and
- 10 • operating upon the software model using the *selected one or more*
- 11 *algorithms* to produce a sequence of test actions.

12 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office relies on its reasoning

13 regarding claims 53-55. Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that the

14 Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

15 Applicant is confused in regards to the applicability of the Office's

16 reasoning in claims 53-55 to this claim. As discussed above, claim 53 recites

17 representing software using a model that describes the software's behavior,

18 selecting one or more algorithms to operate upon the model as a function of the

19 software's social context, and operating on the software model. Claims 54 and 55

20 depend upon claim 53. This claim, however, recites *developing a profile*

21 associated with one or more software developers; selecting, *from a developer's*

22 *profile*, one or more algorithms; and operating upon the software model using the

23 selected one or more algorithms. Nevertheless, Applicant submits that the cited

24 portions of Kita, in regards to claims 53-55, do not disclose or suggest the subject

25 matter of this claim.

1 Without a properly expressed rejection that is applicable to this claim
2 which explains the Office's reasoning, proper notice of rejection has not been
3 provided to the Applicant. Nonetheless, Applicant has studied the reference and
4 submits that the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.
5 Hence, for at least these reasons, this claim is allowable. If the Office disagrees,
6 then Applicant respectfully requests that the Office properly explain its reasoning
7 for its rejection of this claim.

8 **Claim 57** recites a method of testing software comprising:

- 9
- 10 • defining one or more clusters in a software model that models
software that is to be tested;
- 11 • providing *multiple different algorithms* for operating upon the
software model;
- 12 • selecting a first algorithm for operating on the software model to
produce a sequence of test actions;
- 13 • *selecting a second algorithm that is different from the first*
14 *algorithm* for operating on the software model to produce an
additional sequence of test actions; and
- 15 • *operating on the software model using the first and second*
16 *algorithms* to produce the sequences of test actions, *one of the first*
17 *and second algorithms having a better chance at accessing a*
18 *cluster than the other of the first and second algorithms.*

19 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office relies on its reasoning
20 regarding claim 37, which in turn relies on the reasoning in claim 28, which in
21 turn relies on the reasoning in claim 24, which in turn relies on the reasoning in
22 claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that the Office has not
23 established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

24 Applicant is confused in regards to the applicability of the Office's
25 reasoning in claim 1 to this claim. As discussed above, claim 1 recites modeling

1 software and operating on the software model using a random destination
2 algorithm and at least one other different algorithm. In contrast, this claim recites
3 defining one or more clusters in a software model, as claimed; providing multiple
4 different algorithms, as claimed, selecting a first algorithm for operating on the
5 software model, as claimed; selecting a second algorithm that is different from the
6 first algorithm, as claimed, and operating on the software model, as claimed. In
7 fact, this claim does not even expressly recite a “*random destination algorithm*”.

8 Nevertheless, Applicant submits that the cited portions of Kita, in regards
9 to claim 1, do not disclose or suggest the subject matter of this claim.

10 Without a properly expressed rejection that is applicable to this claim and
11 which explains the Office’s reasoning, Applicant has not received proper notice of
12 rejection, as required. Nonetheless, Applicant submits that the Office has not
13 established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Hence, for at least these reasons,
14 this claim is allowable. If the Office disagrees, Applicant requests that the Office
15 properly apply the reference and explain its reasoning for its rejection of this
16 claim.

17 **Claims 58-65** depend from claim 57 and are allowable as depending from
18 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
19 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 57, are neither disclosed
20 nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one
21 another.

22 **Claim 66** recites a software-testing system comprising:

- 23
- 24 • a software model processor configured to:
 - 25 ○ receive a software model that describes behavior associated with software that is to be tested, and

- operate upon the model to provide a sequence of test commands for testing the software; and
- *an algorithm set* associated with the model processor and comprising *multiple different algorithms*, the software model processor being configured to *select at least two different algorithms and use the algorithms to operate upon the software model* to produce the sequence of test commands.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office relies on its reasoning regarding claim 28, which in turn relies on the reasoning in claim 24, which in turn relies on the reasoning in claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Applicant is confused in regards to the applicability of the Office's reasoning in claim 1 to this claim. As discussed above, claim 1 recites modeling software and operating on the software model using a random destination algorithm and at least one other different algorithm. In contrast, this claim includes recitation to "an algorithm set associated with the model processor and comprising multiple different algorithms, the software model processor being configured to select at least two different algorithms and use the algorithms to operate upon the software model to produce the sequence of test commands." In fact, this claim does not even expressly recite a "*random destination algorithm*".

Nevertheless, Applicant submits that the cited portions of Kita, in regards to claim 1, do not disclose or suggest the subject matter of this claim.

Without a properly expressed rejection that is applicable to this claim and which explains the Office's reasoning, Applicant has not received proper notice of rejection, as required. Nonetheless, Applicant submits that the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Hence, for at least these reasons, this claim is allowable. If the Office disagrees, Applicant requests that the Office

1 properly apply the reference and explain its reasoning for its rejection of this
2 claim.

3 **Claims 67-72** depend from claim 66 and are allowable as depending from
4 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
5 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 66, are neither disclosed
6 nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one
7 another.

8 **Claim 73** recites a software-testing system comprising:

- 9
10 • a software model processor configured to:
 - 11 ○ receive a software model in the form of a state graph that
12 describes behavior associated with software, the state graph
13 having multiple nodes that represent state, and links between
14 the nodes that represent actions, and
 - 15 ○ traverse the state graph to provide a sequence of commands
16 for testing the software;
- 17 • an algorithm set associated with the model processor and comprising
18 *multiple different algorithms*; and
- 19 • a graph traverser associated with the model processor and configured
20 to:
 - 21 ○ traverse the state graph using an algorithm from the
22 *algorithm set*, the *algorithm having a first graph traversal*
23 *characteristic* to produce a sequence of test commands, and
 - 24 ○ traverse graph with an algorithm from *the algorithm set*
25 *having a second graph traversal characteristic that is*
different from the first graph traversal characteristic to
produce a further sequence of test commands.

21 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office relies on its reasoning
22 regarding claims 57-59, which in turn relies on the reasoning in claims 2, 17, and
23 37, which ultimately relies on the reasoning in claims 1-2. Applicant respectfully
24
25

1 disagrees and submits that the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of
2 obviousness.

3 Applicant is confused in regards to the applicability of the Office's
4 reasoning in claims 1 and 2 to this claim. As discussed above, claims 1 and 2
5 recite modeling software and operating on the software model using a random
6 destination algorithm and at least one other different algorithm, as claimed. In
7 contrast, this claim includes recitation to "an algorithm set associated with the
8 model processor and comprising multiple different algorithms" and a "graph
9 traverser associated with the model processor" configured to: "traverse the state
10 graph using an algorithm from the algorithm set, the algorithm having a first graph
11 traversal characteristic", as claimed and "traverse graph with an algorithm from
12 the algorithm set having a second graph traversal characteristic, as claimed. In
13 fact, this claim does not even expressly recite a "*random destination algorithm*".

14 Nevertheless, Applicant submits that the cited portions of Kita, in regards
15 to claim 1, do not disclose or suggest the subject matter of this claim.

16 Without a properly expressed rejection that is applicable to this claim and
17 which explains the Office's reasoning, Applicant has not received proper notice of
18 rejection, as required. Nonetheless, Applicant submits that the Office has not
19 established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Hence, for at least these reasons,
20 this claim is allowable. If the Office disagrees, Applicant requests that the Office
21 properly apply the reference and explain its reasoning for its rejection of this
22 claim.

23 **Claims 74 and 75** depend from claim 73 and are allowable as depending
24 from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own
25 recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 73, are neither

disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 76 recites a software-testing system comprising:

- means for receiving a software model;
- means for operating on the software model in a first manner to produce a sequence of test actions; and
- means for operating on the software model in *different additional manners* to produce additional sequences of test actions.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office relies on its reasoning regarding claim 17, which in turn relies on the reasoning in claims 1 and 2. Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness

Applicant is confused in regards to the applicability of the Office's reasoning in claims 1 and 2 to this claim. Nevertheless, Applicant submits that the cited portions of Kita, in regards to claim 1, do not disclose or suggest a means for "operating on the software model in a first manner to produce a sequence of test actions" or "for operating on the software model in different additional manners to produce additional sequences of test actions."

Without a properly expressed rejection that is applicable to this claim and which explains the Office's reasoning, Applicant has not received proper notice of rejection, as required. Nonetheless, Applicant submits that the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Hence, for at least these reasons, this claim is allowable. If the Office disagrees, Applicant requests that the Office properly apply the reference and explain its reasoning for its rejection of this claim.

1 **Claim 77** depends from claim 76 and is allowable as depending from an
2 allowable base claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features
3 which, in combination with those recited in claim 76, are neither disclosed nor
4 suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one
5 another.

6 **Claim 78** recites a method of modeling user behavior comprising:

- 7
- 8 • representing software using a model comprising a state graph, the
state graph having multiple nodes individual ones of which represent
9 a state, and links between the nodes that represent actions;
- 10 • traversing the state graph using an *algorithm having a first graph*
traversal characteristic to produce a sequence of user actions; and
- 11 • traversing the state graph using an algorithm having a *second graph*
traversal characteristic that is different from the first graph
12 *traversal characteristic* to produce a further sequence of user
actions.
- 13

14 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office relies on its reasoning
15 regarding claim 17-18, which in turn relies on the reasoning in claims 1 and 2.
16 Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that the Office has not established a
17 *prima facie* case of obviousness

18 Applicant is confused in regards to the applicability of the Office's
19 reasoning in claims 1 and 2 to this claim. Claims 1 and 2 recite modeling software
20 and operating on the software model using a random destination algorithm and at
21 least one other different algorithm, as claimed. This claim recites representing
22 software, as claimed, and traversing a state graph, as claimed. In fact, this claim
23 does not even expressly recite a "*random destination algorithm*".
24
25

1 Nevertheless, the cited portions of Kita do not disclose or suggest the
2 features in this claim. Specifically, these portions do not disclose or suggest
3 traversing a state graph, as directed in this claim, by traversing the state graph
4 using an *algorithm having a first graph traversal characteristic* to produce a
5 sequence of user actions; and traversing the state graph using an algorithm having
6 a *second graph traversal characteristic that is different from the first graph*
7 *traversal characteristic* to produce a further sequence of user actions.

8 Without a properly expressed rejection that is applicable to this claim and
9 which explains the Office's reasoning, Applicant has not received proper notice of
10 rejection, as required. Nonetheless, Applicant submits that the Office has not
11 established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Hence, for at least these reasons,
12 this claim is allowable. If the Office disagrees, Applicant requests that the Office
13 properly apply the reference and explain its reasoning for its rejection of this
14 claim.

15 16 Conclusion


17 All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant
18 requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next
19 anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability,
20 Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an
21 interview.

22
23 Respectfully Submitted,
24
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Dated: 10/4/04

By: _____


Lance R. Sadler
Reg. No. 38,605
(509) 324-9256